



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/996,978	10/31/2001	Mark D. Markel	A-70829/ENB/VEJ	4719

23715 7590 02/11/2004

JOEL R. PETROW
SMITH & NEPHEW, INC.
1450 BROOKS ROAD
MEMPHIS, TN 38116

EXAMINER

ROANE, AARON F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3739

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2004

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/996,978

Applicant(s)

MARKEL, MARK D.

Examiner

Aaron Roane

Art Unit

3739

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 September 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19, 21, 22 and 24-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 20 and 23 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

Applicant is advised that should claim 20 be found allowable, claim 23 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-19, 21, 22 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggers et al. (USPN 6,066,134) in view of Curley et al. (USPN 6,328,735 B1) and in further view of Underwood et al. (USPN 6,264,651 B1).

Regarding claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-15, 19 and 24-26, Eggers et al. disclose an electrosurgical device and method of use comprising providing a probe (10) having a proximal end and an electrode at a distal end (58), providing an irrigation solution (21), delivering the irrigating solution into an arthroscopic environment to substantially fill the arthroscopic environment with irrigating solution, introducing the distal extremity of the probe into the arthroscopic environment, positioning the electrode adjacent the surface of the tissue, supplying thermal energy to the electrode so as to treat the tissue whereby the irrigating solution inhibits undesirable heating below the surface of the tissue, and aspirating the irrigating solution through a lumen in the probe, see abstract, col. 2, lines 15-20, col. 3, lines 4-16, 64-67, col. 4, lines 15-50 and col. 5, lines 18-40 and figures 1-25. Eggers et al. further disclose a saline solution, see col. 2, lines 14-20, col. 3, lines 4-16 and col. 7, lines 57-59. Eggers et al. further disclose supplying radio frequency to the active electrode (58) and the return electrode (56) carried on the distal end of the probe through a radio frequency generator (28), see col. 4, lines 14-36 and col. 13, lines 19-36 and figures 1-11. Eggers et al. further disclose monitoring the temperature within the arthroscopic environment with a temperature measuring device and adjusting the amount of energy supplied to the electrodes in response to the temperature, see col. 14, lines 1-18, lines 46-62 and claim 25. Finally, Eggers et al. disclose an embodiment wherein the aspiration lumen is formed as an annular lumen (54) or annular gap, see col. 17, lines 41-54, col. 19, lines 28-41 and figure 9. Eggers et al. fail to disclose that a warm solution is used for irrigation and that the lumen has a distal opening located within a cavity defined

by the probe and that the electrode is disposed in the cavity. Eggers et al. also fail to explicitly recite that the temperature sensor is carried by the distal extremity of the probe. Curley et al. disclose a thermal ablation system and method and teach the use of supplying a warmed or heated (heated above body temperature, preferably to 50° C, see col. 5, lines 29-35) saline solution in order reduce charring and impedance rises normally occurring in treated tissue and convect the thermal energy deeper into the tissue, see col. 3 lines 14-45. Underwood et al. disclose a device and method very similar to that of Eggers et al. and teach an alternate arthroscopic method of treatment by placing the electrode (160) in a cavity (most right portion of opening within 162) wherein the opening is the distal end opening of an aspiration lumen (162), see col. 21, line 42 through col. 22, line 18 and figure 10. It is well known in the art to place a temperature sensor at the distal extremity of the probe, adjacent to the energy emitting electrodes in order to sense the temperature. As an example, Underwood et al. teach the inclusion of "a temperature controller coupled to one or more temperature sensors at or near the distal end of the probe. The controller adjusts the output voltage of the power supply in response to a temperature set point and the measured temperature value," see col. 6, lines 23-36. Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Eggers et al., as taught by Curley et al., to supply a warmed or heated saline solution in order reduce charring and impedance rises normally occurring in treated tissue and convect the thermal energy deeper into the tissue, and as further taught by Underwood et al., to provide an alternate yet equivalent arthroscopic treatment by placing the electrode in a cavity wherein the opening is the

Art Unit: 3739

distal end opening of an aspiration lumen, and finally as is well known in the art and shown by Underwood et al., to “include a temperature controller coupled to one or more temperature sensors at or near the distal end of the probe. The controller adjusts the output voltage of the power supply in response to a temperature set point and the measured temperature value.”

Regarding claim 4, Eggers et al. in view of Curley et al. and in further view of Underwood et al. disclose the claimed invention. Eggers et al. in view of Curley et al. and in further view of Underwood et al. is silent as to the tissue bath. However Applicant asserts the well known equivalence between the tissue bath heating means and “other means known in the art”, see page 7, lines 23-25.

Regarding claim 11, Eggers et al. disclose the claimed invention, see claims 2-7.

Regarding claims 16 and 17, Eggers et al. disclose the claimed invention, see claim 24.

Regarding claim 18, Eggers et al. discloses the claimed invention wherein “delivering the solution comprises pressurizing the arthroscopic environment.” Inherently the introduction of a foreign or outside fluid into a body cavity involves pressurizing the arthroscopic environment.

Art Unit: 3739

Regarding claim 21, Eggers et al. disclose the claimed invention, see col. 19, lines 15-28 and figure 7.

Regarding claim 22, Eggers et al. disclose the claimed invention, see col. 9, line 50 through col. 10, line 4, col. 12, lines 44-62.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 20 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Amendment

The examiner acknowledges the amendments made to the claims. Consequently, a new grounds for rejection has been made.

Additionally, claims 20 and 23 are interpreted as duplicate claims.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron Roane whose telephone number is (703) 305-7377. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am - 5pm, Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda Dvorak can be reached on (703) 308-0994. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3739

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A.R. *A.R.*
February 5, 2004

Roy D. Gibson
ROY D. GIBSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER